<u>REMARKS</u>

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated June 17, 2005. Claims 126 to 147 are pending in the application, of which Claims126, 136 and 146 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 36 to 61, 80 to 86, 99 to 105, 117, 118 and 123 to 147 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over "Pad: An Alternative Approach to the Computer Interface" (Perlin) in view of "Developing Calendar Visualizers for the Information Visualizer" (Mackinlay). Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Claims 36 to 61, 80 to 86, 99 to 105, 117, 118 and 123 to 125 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter.

Amended Claim 126 is now directed to a hierarchical data display method of displaying hierarchically-managed data items. The method comprises the steps of setting in a background indicating a hierarchical level, a first area in which data item(s) belonging to the parent hierarchical level is displayed and a second area in which data item(s) belonging to a child hierarchical level is displayed, so that the first and second areas are displayed exclusively and without overlapping each other in a display area of every hierarchical level; and controlling a display of data icons respectively representing the data items in each of the areas.

In contrast, Perlin fails to disclose a first area in which data items belonging to the parent hierarchical level are displayed and a second area in which data items belonging to a child hierarchical level are displayed, so that the first and second areas are displayed exclusively and without overlapping each other in a display area of every hierarchical level. In the Office Action, it is suggested that Perlin et al. disclose that the first and second areas are exclusively set in a background. On page 6 and again on page 8 of the Office Action it is stated that the Pad

information plane of Perlin corresponds to the background of the present invention, the screen of Perlin corresponds to the first area of the present invention, and the portals of Perlin correspond to the second area(s).

However, Applicants respectfully disagree with this characterization of the disclosures of Perlin. As apparent from Fig. 1 in page 59 of Perlin, various zoomed areas, such as the portals, using "magnifying glasses" are only displayed on the screen, and there is no hierarchical relation between the areas or between the screen and the areas. Also, as apparent from Fig. 1 in page 59 of Perlin, the screen and the portals are displayed while overlapping each other. Thus the portals are displayed as overlapping each other in a display area of every hierarchical level, the first and second portals are not displayed exclusively and without overlapping each other. That is, the display positions of the portals can be set on the screen as user likes, but are not conditioned so as to be displayed exclusively and without overlapping each other.

Therefore, Perlin neither discloses nor suggests setting in a background indicating a parent hierarchical level, a first area in which data item(s) belonging the parent hierarchical level is displayed and a second area in which data item(s) belonging to a child hierarchical level is displayed, so that the first and second areas are displayed exclusively and without overlapping each other in a display area of every hierarchical level.

Furthermore, Fig. 2 in page 110 of Mackinlay discloses a hierarchical relation between areas including a year's calendar on a floor and a month's calendar on a left wall. However, an area of the child level month's calendar is not exclusively displayed on a parent background of the floor indicating the parent level year's calendar. Therefore, it cannot be said that Mackinlay discloses or suggests a first area in which data item(s) belonging to the parent

- 10 -

hierarchical level is displayed and a second area in which data item(s) belonging to a child hierarchical level is displayed, so that the first and second areas are displayed exclusively and without overlapping each other in a display area of every hierarchical level. Accordingly, Mackinlay does not provide that which is missing in Perlin.

In light of the deficiencies of Perlin and Mackinlay as discussed above, Applicants submit that amended independent Claim 126 is now in condition for allowance and respectfully request same.

Amended independent Claims 136 and 146 are directed to an apparatus and a A program executable by a computer, respectively, substantially in accordance with the method of Claim126. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claims 136 and 146 are also now in condition for allowance and respectfully request same.

On another matter, an Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) was filed in the subject application on January 9, 2004 and on February 3, 2004, but initialed copies of the Forms PTO-1449 filed therewith have not yet been received by Applicants' undersigned attorney. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner initial and return the enclosed copies of the Forms PTO-1449 in question, to indicate that the references listed thereon have been considered and made formally of record.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

Frank L. Cire
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 42,419

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 102058v1